## REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

# FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF P69-129W<sup>4</sup>, Log No. 04-18-003; Trinity Presbyterian Church of Spring Valley

July 27, 2006

| I. HABITAT LOSS PERMIT ORDINANCE – Does the proposed project conform to the  |                 |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Habitat Loss Pe  | ermit/Coastal S | Sage Scrub (                 | Ordinance findings?  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES             | NO                           | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion:  |                 |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| of the Multiple S  | Species Conse   | rvation Prog                 | rovements are located within the boundaries gram. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat ce findings is not required.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| II. MSCP/BMO - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance? |                 |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES             | NO                           | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion:  |                 |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conservation Purban develope   | rogram and co   | onforms to the will occur to | boundaries of the Multiple Species be required findings, as the entire project site is any sensitive habitat or species. See MSCP Sub-Area Plan for further information. |  |  |  |  |  |
| III. GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?          |                 |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES             | NO                           | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion:  |                 |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The project will obtain its water supply from the Helix Water District, which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

### IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

| The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Article IV, Sections 1 & 2) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?        | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT     |
|--|-----|----|---------------------------|
| The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?            | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT     |
| The Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5)?   | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT  ☑  |
| The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Section 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?                    | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT     |
| The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance? | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT   □ |

#### Discussion:

Wetland and Wetland Buffers: The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the RPO. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year.

Floodways and Floodplain Fringe: The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined by the RPO, nor is it near a watercourse plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map.

**Steep Slopes:** The site contains no steep slopes as defined by RPO. The site does not contain land with a natural gradient of 25 percent or greater and a minimum rise of 50 feet.

Sensitive Habitats: The project site does not support sensitive habitat lands as defined by RPO. The site does not contain rare, endangered, or substantially depleted species of vegetation or animals, nor does the site constitute critical area to the ecological viability of any such species.

Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites: The project will not impact historical resources because prior disturbance of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to buried historical resources.

| V. STORMWATER ORDINANCE (WPO) - Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?  |     |    |                |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|-----|----|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion:  |     |    |                |  |  |  |  |  |
| The project submitted a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) prepared by Burkett & Wong, dated April 19, 2006, which identifies potential construction and post-construction pollutants that may result from the project and also identifies best management practices (BMPs) to address the pollutants. As such the project is not anticipated to result in any substantial increase in polluted runoff or any significant adverse effects to water quality. The SWMP received for the project has been approved by DPW and it has been found that the project will reduce adverse effects to water quality to the maximum extent practicable and as such complies with the requirements of the WPO. |     |    |                |  |  |  |  |  |
| VI. NOISE ORDINANCE – Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan and the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance?  |     |    |                |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | YES | NO | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Discussion:

The proposal would not expose people to nor generate potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit because review of the project indicates that the project is not in close proximity to a railroad and/or airport. Additionally, the County of San Diego GIS noise model does not indicate that the project would be subject to potential excessive noise levels from Circulation Element roads either now or at General Plan buildout.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.

Even though the proposal could expose people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the County General Plan or Noise Ordinance), the following project mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the noise impacts to applicable limits:

parapet walls for rooftop equipment, equipment noise performance specifications, and hours of operation for the day use facilities.

ND07-06\0418003-ORDCHKLST;jcr